



## REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE (RFA) FORM INTAKE INTERVIEW LOG

<b>Date:</b> 12/22/14	<b>Interviewer:</b> Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, Mohammed Cato	<b>RFA #14 – 28</b>
<b>Person(s) Requesting Assistance:</b> [REDACTED]		
<b>Contact Numbers (telephone, e-mail, etc.):</b> [REDACTED]		
<b>Status of Person(s) Interviewed (title, position, student status, etc.):</b> Staff in [REDACTED]		
<b>Requested Assistance Pertaining To (name, position, policy, project, etc.)</b> Concerns about pay equity		

To the best of your knowledge, please fill out the following:

Interviewee Status:    Male ☒ Female ☐    Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☒ Student ☐  
 Concern Regarding:    Male ☐ Female ☐    Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐ Staff ☐ Student ☐

**Category:** *(Please check at least one)*

- |  |  |   |                                     |  |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Color             | <input type="checkbox"/> Creed              | <input type="checkbox"/> Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Veteran Status      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status                | <input type="checkbox"/> National Origin   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race    | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion   | <input type="checkbox"/> Retaliation         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sex/Gender                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Genetic Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Identity or Expression |  |   |                                     |  |

Time Line		
Date	Item	Comments
10/21/2014	Laura Langley met with [REDACTED] for initial intake.	<p>[REDACTED] is the only [REDACTED] on campus. He says he is paid 30% less than peers at WWU and that he is the only professional staff [REDACTED] employee who is a person of color.</p> <p>[REDACTED] is grade 6 and says he is the only professional staff person who works in [REDACTED] and is grade 6. Except for [REDACTED], all other [REDACTED] people are grade 7 or higher. [REDACTED] says he should be grade 7 or higher. He thinks grade 9 is more accurate for his job.</p> <p>[REDACTED] says a [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] position in the Library posted 8/2012 has a salary of \$72,000 and the minimum requirements are less than for his job. [REDACTED] says that [REDACTED] now has this position and that it is closest to what [REDACTED] does.</p> <p>[REDACTED] is [REDACTED] supervisor and [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] supervisor. [REDACTED] believes they support him as being classified at a higher grade. After he was classified as grade 6 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] resubmitted [REDACTED] position review to HR, this time using words and</p>

		<p>phrases from the [REDACTED] position, which is classified at a higher grade. HR said that he was still a grade 6.</p> <p>[REDACTED] classification has been appealed again by his department to HR, but they have not heard the results. [REDACTED] wonders about how long his position has been inappropriately classified. He feels that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are being tasked with busy work around the appeal of [REDACTED] classification.</p> <p>[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have been having conversations with HR. [REDACTED] has not spoken with HR and says he has never been given the rationale for his classification.</p>
11/6/2014	Sue Guenter-Schlesinger (SGS) met with [REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] reiterated what he had said to Laura Langley (see above), but said he did not believe his perceived pay inequity was based on a protected characteristic. SGS explained to [REDACTED] that if this was the case, that his issue would not be a matter for the EO Office. SGS said she would be glad to refer this back to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that he should follow-up with them and HR.</p>
11/13/2014	Email from [REDACTED] to SGS	<p>[REDACTED] forwarded Sue an email he received from Danna Fritz that morning stating that the July 30, 2014 determination that his position is a [REDACTED] still stands.</p>
11/18/2014	Email from [REDACTED] to Danna and forwarded to SGS	<p>[REDACTED] sought clarification of the results of his supervisors' appeal of his compensation analysis completed July 30. Danna responded that the result of the appeal is that he was correctly placed in the [REDACTED] payroll title. [REDACTED] says they had told him the appeal would move him up a grade or two and now they have backtracked on this.</p>
	SGS follow-up	<p>SGS followed up by talking with [REDACTED] on the phone and with [REDACTED] in person, regarding [REDACTED] concerns and indicating that [REDACTED] did not feel his issue was based on an EO protected category. [REDACTED] indicated he would follow-up with [REDACTED] supervisors and with HR.</p>
12/20/2014	Email from [REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] sends email to Bruce Shepard, Doug Adelstein, SGS, Chyerl Wolfe-Lee, [REDACTED], Mohammed Cato, and Laura Langley claiming his civil rights have been violated on the basis of race.</p>
12/20/2014	Email from Chyerl to [REDACTED]	<p>Responding to [REDACTED] email. You will be contacted on Monday to discuss your concerns; Chyerl is confident a "healthy resolution is achievable."</p>
12/22/2014	Email from [REDACTED] to Chyerl	<p>Should [REDACTED] still be expecting someone to contact him to discuss his concerns, and who will contact him?</p>
12/22/2014	Email from Doug Adelstein to [REDACTED]	<p>Saying that he feels badly that [REDACTED] perceives that race has impacted this process and that it has had no impact on the pace or determinations. Chyerl, Danna and [REDACTED] are out this week. Doug is taking the lead and has spoken with Eileen and [REDACTED] this morning. Can't respond to all of [REDACTED] concerns this week because of holiday schedules, but [REDACTED] hopes to meet with you today.</p> <p>[REDACTED] responds that this is unacceptable delay for another week. Says he wants to begin the formal complaint process.</p>
12/22/2014	Email from SGS to [REDACTED]	<p>Please give me a call tomorrow morning to schedule an appointment.</p>
12/21 – 12/22/2014	SGS consulted	<p>SGS consulted with [REDACTED], Eileen Coughlin, and Chyerl Wolfe-Lee by telephone, and indicated that she would meet with [REDACTED] regarding his allegation that his civil rights were violated.</p>

12/23/2014	SGS & Mohammed Cato (MC) conference call with [REDACTED]	<p>SGS and MC spoke with [REDACTED] on a conference call (as [REDACTED] was ill), to address his concerns expressed in his 12/20/2014 email.</p> <p>He agreed to have [REDACTED] join in the conversation. [REDACTED] SGS, and MC spoke again to [REDACTED] an hour later. In this conversation [REDACTED] offered as a first step, a pay increase to [REDACTED] and the commitment to continue discussion regarding his classification.</p> <p>In subsequent email today, [REDACTED] recognizes that the offer of increasing pay to \$60,000 is well-intentioned but says it perpetuates his feeling of not being respected in relation to other [REDACTED] y workers.</p>
12/24/2014	Email from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]	Thank you for the email. [REDACTED] and the other stakeholders will advocate a timely resolution within the next two weeks about your concerns regarding pay equity.
12/29/2014	SGS & MC met with [REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] indicated he was insulted by [REDACTED] offer and agreed for the EO Office to initiate an informal resolution to his situation through a Request for Assistance (RFA).</p> <p>[REDACTED] remains very frustrated, since he claims that Danna Fritz, HR classification/compensation administrator, has told him he should be upped by 1 or 2 grades, but then nothing happens. This has been going on for over a year. [REDACTED] claims the [REDACTED] position in the Library used his job description and that was classified 2 grades higher than his.</p>
1/6/15	Phone call between [REDACTED] and MC	<p>[REDACTED] informed MC that he met with Chyerl, Doug and Eileen on 1/5/15 to discuss a salary and grade change for [REDACTED] position.</p> <p>[REDACTED] also informed MC that he told [REDACTED] that Chyerl would reach out to him in the next few days to set up a meeting.</p>
1/6/15	MC met with [REDACTED]	<p>[REDACTED] informed MC in a phone conversation that he was meeting with Chyerl at 4:00pm. During the phone conversation, MC shared that EO was in the process of conducting an analysis of [REDACTED] job positions on campus.</p> <p>After the 4:00pm meeting, [REDACTED] met with MC to continue the conversation. According to [REDACTED] Chyerl indicated that HR was going to increase the salary of his position including backpay and a grade change. [REDACTED] preferred a higher salary but felt that HR was making a good faith effort to address his concerns. MC explained that EO would follow up with [REDACTED] and HR to further facilitate if necessary. [REDACTED] expressed appreciation for EO's involvement and said that he was just waiting to receive official confirmation about the salary, backpay and grade change. Chyerl indicated that he would probably see the salary change in his 1/25/15 paycheck.</p>
2/9/15	[REDACTED] contacted MC	[REDACTED] indicated that his direct deposit reflected his new wage and backpay. [REDACTED] said that he would contact EO if he had any further concerns.